

Mime-Version: 1.0  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 15:26:43 -0700  
To: Harold\_Varmus@nih.gov  
From: Cozzarelli <ncozzare@socrates.berkeley.edu>  
Subject: Fwd: E-Biosci Poll

Harold,

I sent the message below to members of the PNAS editorial board, the NAS publication committee, and the PNAS staff. Thus far the results are very encouraging with most voting for no delay and some voting for Options 1 and 3.

I am concerned though about the issue of site accessibility. If you take a hard stance that the content must be given no strings attached to E-biosci, then a longer and longer-lived delay in release to E-biosci will be the likely consequence. I personally find the arguments on both sides to be not strong. I understand the reasons for having access from E-biosci and also the reasons for having access from E-biosci and the publisher's sites. Getting faster release is more important to me than any of the arguments. Others though (Ken, Diane, Floyd Bloom) feel much more strongly than I do about limiting access to their own sites. If access is to be from E-biosci, then they will want to protect their own site through a delay in release.

Nick

>X-Sender: ncozzare@socrates.berkeley.edu (Unverified)  
>Mime-Version: 1.0  
>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 15:23:35 -0700  
>To: (PNAS Editoria Board & Publications Committee)  
>ncozzare@socrates.berkeley.edu,  
> balberts@nas.edu (Bruce Alberts),  
> dsullenb@nas.edu (Diane Sullenberger), kfulton@nas.edu (Ken Fulton),  
> mconway@annap.infi.net (Morna Conway), jmalloy@nas.edu (John Malloy),  
> griddiho@nas.edu (Guy Riddihough)  
>From: Nicholas Cozzarelli <ncozzare@socrates.berkeley.edu>  
>Subject: E-Biosci Poll  
>Cc: jrzepka@nas.edu (Joe Rzepka)  
>  
>  
>This is the most important issue we have had to consider for PNAS, how to  
>participate in E-biosci (née E-Biomed). Diane, Ken, and I had a productive  
>meeting last Thursday with Harold Varmus and David Lipman, Director of the  
>National Library of Medicine's National Center for Biotechnology  
>Information. I feel that Harold has answered all of my concerns. There is  
>one technical issue that we need to iron out, but I hope that will be done  
>this week and I will not burden you with it. Please refer to my previous  
>emails for a cost analysis of E-biosci. E-biosci will probably kick in  
>sometime early next year. Any increase in author charges to make up for a  
>subscription loss, would not be until 2001. If we make money on it next  
>year, we would just have to give it back to the government indirect cost  
>pool.  
>  
>I see 4 options as to when we give a copy of PNAS content to E-biosci:  
>1. ASAP, before print release and as soon as an article is approved

>2. 0 delay, at time of print release  
>3. Short delay, of 1-2 issues  
>4. Long delay, more than 4 issues  
>  
>Analysis  
>Option 1 is where we want to be in the future, but seems too risky now. It  
>will significantly reduce print subscriptions and has the added cost of  
>ASAP. Also, it will confuse the experiment on E-biosci with that on ASAP.  
>Option 2 will be of great benefit to authors and put PNAS in a leadership  
>role, where the house organ of the academy should be. It will encourage  
>other journals to follow our lead. It is risky though, particularly before  
>we know what our competitors are doing. Option 3 is still a valuable  
>advance to readers and authors, and is a conservative experiment. If  
>subscriptions are strong by late next year, we could go for Option 2 in  
>2001. If there is a significant drop in subscriptions, we could increase  
>page charges to make up for the loss and either keep the lag where it is or  
>reduce it. Our leadership for the good of science is less than in the prior  
>options. Option 4 is the almost no risk alternative. There will likely be  
>little effect on income. We may lose authors to journals who choose less of  
>a delay, and we duck a leadership role.  
>  
>I hope as many as possible not only vote but make a comment. If you want it  
>shared with everyone then send the comment to "cdea@socrates.berkeley.edu"  
>with the subject, "E-biosci comment."  
>  
>This is a straw poll. The final decision will be made by the Council and  
>the Publications Committee and I have included Members of that committee  
>and key staff in the poll. I am sure though that the results of the poll  
>will be highly influential in making the final decision.  
>  
>Please vote by putting an "X" within the brackets [ X ]:  
>  
>[ ] OPTION 1 (ASAP, before print release and as soon as an article is  
>approved)  
>[ ] OPTION 2 (0 delay, at time of print release)  
>[ ] OPTION 3 (Short delay, of 1-2 issues)  
>[ ] OPTION 4 (Long delay, more than 4 issues)  
>

Nicholas R. Cozzarelli  
401 Barker Hall  
Department of Molecular and Cell Biology  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, Ca 94720  
510 642-5266 Tel.  
643-1079 Fax